


REMARKS

The Examiner rejected independent claims 1, 6, and 13 as being anticipated by the Chou et al. reference. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Chou et al. reference simply does not show or suggest a host computer system that (1) has access to data representing cargo transportation options available from each of a plurality of cargo carriers, (2) prompts a user for information concerning cargo to be transported and transportation preferences, (3) compares the user information with the available cargo transportation options, and (4) sends to the user at least one of the available cargo transportation options best matching the user information, as specifically recited in Independent Claim 1. Rather, the Chou et al. reference merely discloses a method and apparatus for electronic trading of carrier cargo capacity. A plurality of shippers 10 and a plurality of carriers 12 each place one more orders or offers, termed bids 14 and asks 16, respectively, through an electronic network 17 to a clearinghouse 18 via the internet. The clearinghouse 18 collects the bids 14 and asks 16 and, at periodic intervals, matches them at block 20 into a set of "trades" by a method that models the priorities and objectives of a double auction. Thus, Independent Claim 1 is clearly not anticipated by the Chou et al. reference. Independent Claims 6 and 13 are clearly not anticipated by the Chou et al. reference for the same reasons. Thus, it is believed that the claims are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard S. MacMillan
Reg. No. 30,085

MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC
One Maritime Plaza, Fifth Floor
720 Water Street
Toledo, Ohio 43604
(419) 255-5900